David P. Larsen
43 N. Grand Oaks
Pasadena, CA 91107
7/14/72

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

First of all, I would like to thank you for your prompt mailing of the books I requested (Whitewash, Oswald in New Orleans), and for your response to my letter.

I would like to respond to a few things you stated, since I feel that perhaps you misunderstood the gist of my letter (or, more likely, I misstated). I certainly did not intend to try and convince you that Jack Ruby called John Connally. I do not know that. Yet, neither am I able to state immediately and categorically (as you apparently are) that he could not have.

Neither did I mean to imply that I felt Ruby must have called Connally in order to tell him to "duck." It is, admittedly, the most far-fetched scenario (at least that I could think of). What I intended to show was that even that "far-fetched" possibility could not be entirely ruled out "offhand" - without some investigation. The point that I attempted to make is, that without knowing whether Ruby called Connally, it is quite impossible for me - or you - to determine why he called. The problem that I had with your initial (and immediate) response - and the reason that I felt constrained to write in the first place - was that your

apparent ability to decide what is "nonsense" (actually, I believe the word was "bullshit") without any investigation whatsoever.

Perhaps I could be so bold as to quote you: "Logical people, those who are careful and painstaking, usually learn enough about the facts before permitting themselves to form even tentative conclusions." In this case, however, you <u>believe</u> it's nonsense and you therefore immediately rule out even the possibility of investigation. In your writings you suggest that it is acceptable to begin an investigation with a theory already in mind, but <u>only</u> with the proviso that your theory <u>not</u> be used to the exclusion of all other possibilities. If I may again quote you, a person should "<u>search</u> and <u>study</u> [perhaps even contact the people involved??] to see if the facts support the conclusions they have in mind. But <u>never</u> do they lose sight of other alternatives...." It seems to me that in this particular instance you <u>began</u> with a conclusion - with many a hint of investigation. And <u>that</u> seems to me to be the very mindset that you have so diligently and tirelessly labored against for almost thirty years.

It also seemed to me that in your letter to me you transposed the meaning of "investigate" and "conclude." I have not

concluded anything. When you stated, "If you want to investigate the report that the world is flat, OK. But don't expect others to agree with you," that transposition of meaning is displayed. It seems to me that one does not agree or disagree with an "investigation;" one agrees or disagrees with its conclusions. If someone today were to conclude that the world is flat, I would heartily concur that very few people would agree. I might even concur that it would be quite a waste of time to re-investigate such a thing. But remember, that is precisely because it has already been so thoroughly and adequately investigated over hundreds of years by (perhaps?) thousands of people (and, I might add, final "proofs" of the spherical nature of the earth were only presented in the space age). But in all my years of research on the Kennedy assassination (and though I have read dozens and dozens of books — and many more articles — I readily admit I have not read everything), I have never seen one mention of anyone investigating whether or not Ruby might have called Connally (let alone, what his reason(s) might have been). You conclude that he did not. But you did not investigate. You may think (believe!) that it's an

absurd theory, but (at least according to your own earlier writings) until you thoroughly investigate, you cannot conclude that.

Personally, I do not have the financial resources or the network of acquaintances (etc.) to adequately track down such a "lead." Consequently I was hoping to be able to put the information in the hands of someone who might. I see that that person is not you, and I apologize for wasting your time. I will attempt to continue to investigate without drawing any conclusions until I am satisfied I have all the available facts (or the complete lack of them!).

I have heard (and also gather from some of the things you said) that your health has not been everything you might like lately (though I certainly do not have "all the facts"!). I will continue to pray for your restoration to full health (and many more fruitful years (with God's peace). God bless!

Respectfully yours,
David Larsen

P.S. You also stated in your letter that Connally had nothing to do with the motorcade route. In the sense that he may not have been one of the "planners" at

the table (so to speak) I might agree, but otherwise I beg to differ. In June 1963 Connally met with LBJ and JFK at the Cortez Hotel in Texas. During that meeting the decision was finalized for the trip to Texas. By September, Connally suggested the motorcade through downtown Dallas. He later helped set in motion the plans for the motorcade. There are two books (probably many more?) which further describe Connally's continuing role in maintaining the motorcade route through Dealey Plaza: Jerry Bruno's, The Advance Man and Craig Zirbel's, The Texas Connection. And Bruno (at least) was there himself. In October of '63 he met personally with Connally in Dallas. By his own recollection he strongly objected to the route through Dealey Plaza. Connally – strangely? – was absolutely adamant that the route be maintained. He (Connally) went so far as to get on the phone to the White House and plead his case (Bruno did not speak – or hear the White House side of the conversation). When Connally hung up he maintained that the White House had agreed completely with the planned route. Therefore Bruno demurred. It was only much later, following the assassination, that Bruno discovered that Connally had completely misrepresented the White House's (over)

position. I stand by my statement: Connally had <u>much</u> to do with the motorcade route. In fact, he (and LBJ) had much to do with the trip – and motorcade – happening at all!